

# In the United States Court of Federal Claims

No. 24-67

Filed: September 19, 2024

---

RAMEY ALAINE CHISUM,

*Plaintiff,*

v.

THE UNITED STATES,

*Defendant.*

---

## ORDER

Since the court directed Plaintiff Ramey Chisum to respond to the Government's motion to dismiss, ECF No. 11, Plaintiff has filed three documents. First, Plaintiff filed a response to the Government's motion to dismiss on August 14, 2024, ECF No. 12. Plaintiff then filed a document on August 19, 2024, that was filed by leave of the court on August 23, 2024, as additional argument for her response to the Government's motion to dismiss. ECF No. 13; ECF No. 14. On September 16, 2024, Plaintiff filed a third document titled "Writ of Habeas Corpus." This document was filed by leave of the court. ECF No. 17; ECF No. 18.

This court does not have subject matter jurisdiction to grant a petition for a writ of habeas corpus. *Ledford v. United States*, 297 F.3d 1378, 1380-81 (Fed. Cir. 2002); *Piano v. United States*, 44 F. App'x 461, 462 (Fed. Cir. 2002); *Perales v. United States*, 399 F. App'x 581, 581 (Fed. Cir. 2010). Thus, the court DISMISSES Plaintiff's petition for a writ of habeas corpus for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. RCFC 12(h)(3). Upon reviewing Plaintiff's September 16, 2024, filing, the court determined the filing raises many of the same arguments that Plaintiff has raised in her prior filings in response to the Government's motion to dismiss. *See* ECF No. 12; ECF No. 14. The court will address Plaintiff's arguments raised in her prior filings when ruling on the Government's motion to dismiss.

It is so ORDERED.

s/ Edward H. Meyers

Edward H. Meyers

Judge